

# CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*



## Civil Rights and Democracy

The democratic process is subject to some curious quirks and frustrations. Take, for example, the President's proposal for guaranteeing the vote to Negroes in the Administration bill prepared by Attorney General Brownell. This bill provides that injunctions be issued by Federal courts against any local authorities who have denied the Negroes the most basic of democratic rights, the right to vote. The bill provides that the Federal court can issue an injunction and can hold anyone in contempt who disobeys the injunction. One would think that it would be impossible to challenge the logic of justice supporting the bill.

However, Senator Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina has found a way of pitting another democratic right against the right to vote. This other right is the right of trial by jury. He has proposed an amendment, which southerners are backing, according to which a Federal judge cannot hold anyone in contempt without a trial by jury.

In spite of the fact that in our tradition contempt proceedings have never required jury trials, the rather desperate protagonists of the southern way of life now find themselves very much exercised about this denial of a jury trial. The amendment proposed by Senator Ervin may pass, or may have already been passed before these words reach the reader. If the amendment passes it will lame the force of the new law, because no southern jury will hold a local officer in contempt if he defies a Federal court on this issue. It is ironic that a southern white legislator should, in the name of democracy, produce exactly the same confusion as a northern Negro congressman, Adam Clayton

Powell, introduced when he demanded that the bill for Federal aid to education should prohibit all aid to schools which were not integrated. This was also done in the name of democracy, but it made the passage of the bill practically impossible.

One feels that somehow or other the democratic process will gradually overcome all these frustrations, whether caused by chicane or abstract idealism, but the Negroes will have to exercise patience and be sustained by a robust faith that history will gradually fulfill the logic of justice.

Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois has pointed out that one of the ironies of this form of democratic idealism is that, in some areas, the right to vote is a prerequisite to the right to serve on juries. Therefore, the juries to which Senator Ervin appeals are precisely the weighted juries which cannot give justice.

In the memorable Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington, the youthful Negro champion, the Rev. Martin Luther King, wisely insisted that if only our democracy would give the Negro the elemental right of suffrage, all other injustice would be eliminated in time and would be eliminated without violence. Dr. King's logic is certainly irrefutable. The right to vote is more basic than the right to a trial by jury.

It is important to add that we ought to be more resolute in establishing the basic right of universal suffrage than on the issue of integrated schools. The latter issue is filled with very great complexities which are probably not fully recognized by either northern liberals or southern conservatives.

R.N.

Vol. XVII, No. 12 July 8, 1957 \$3.00 per year; 15 cents per copy

## THE SUPREME COURT AND THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

SOME YEARS ago the distinguished constitutional lawyer John Lord O'Brian declared, in a series of lectures at Harvard, that the Supreme Court had not recently given decisions which were in accord with its traditional role as the guardian of the individual against the usurpations of government, a role to which it is destined by reason of its authoritative interpretation of the Bill of Rights.

If this judgment was correct, the decisions handed down by the Court on June 17th have invalidated it. In three decisions the Court found the State Department wrong in dismissing John Stewart Service for indiscretion; it reversed the decision which held a former Communist labor leader in contempt of Congress because, even though he was himself a most cooperative witness, he did not reveal the names of other former Communists and; most important, it ordered the retrial of Communists who were convicted under the Smith Act and decreed that the Government would have to prove not only the advocacy of the overthrow of the government in theory, but would have to prove that the defendant conspired for and advocated a specific act of rebellion. This decision does much to lame the force of the Smith Act and, in essence, reverses a previous decision of the Court, which was so much regretted by many anti-Communists who thought the act was unconstitutional.

The reversal of the contempt of Congress decision will be very salutary in preventing irresponsible congressional committees from invading the rights of individuals in pseudo-judicial proceedings in which the defendant is naked of the safeguards which constitute the stuff of justice. These decisions give the American citizen a proud consciousness of the virtue of the "separation of powers" which our fathers made the very basis of the structure of democratic justice.

The Supreme Court may not always be right, for it is not gifted with divine infallibility. It was probably wrong in a previous decision in which it ordered the du Pont Company to divest itself of its 23 percent of stock in the General Motors Corporation. The issue is technical and we should not judge. But one can be practically certain that on civil rights issues the Court is liable to be more nearly right than either Congress or the executive. For it does not wield power but checks power.

It is nice to have an organ of government which

transcends the animosities of party conflict and momentary prejudices. But it is also comforting that the Court is not so remote that it is not, in the words of Mr. Dooley, "able to follow the election returns" and be the expression of the considered convictions of the nation, not necessarily inflexible but not as inconsistent and vagrant as party opinion.

R.N.

## THE "STATUS-OF-FORCES" TREATIES

RECENT INCIDENTS in Japan and Formosa (the former of which has raised questions now being referred to the Supreme Court) bring to the fore once more the problem of the "status-of-forces" treaties. "Status-of-forces" treaties govern the rights and obligations of United States service men stationed overseas. They also cover foreign troops in training here.

With troops spread over considerable areas of the globe, a certain amount of friction with the native populations is almost certain to arise, even when the greatest possible care is given to working out proper arrangements with the host nation.

These treaties grant primary jurisdiction to the host nation to try, in its own courts, foreign soldiers accused of violating its civil or criminal codes. It is accepted international custom that sovereign states have authority over all lawbreakers within their borders. In most cases, however, the local government waives jurisdiction in favor of military justice if the charge is related to performance of duty or to an act on the military base. Investigations made by our own Defense Department indicate that our men have been treated with fairness and leniency by foreign justice.

The whole problem of extra-territorial rights is a touchy one, both at home and abroad. Our government has worked conscientiously on the whole in dealing with this problem. However, there still appears to be somewhat of a double standard in practice at the moment. While these treaties are in force in all European countries, Japan is the only Asian nation with which we have such a treaty.

In light of the struggle for the mind of Asia at this point in history, this is particularly unfortunate. Asians find it very easy to distrust us, to be cynical: after all, we *do* discriminate against our dark-skinned citizens; we *are* a nation of wealth while they are poor nations; we can hardly maintain complete innocence in face of charges of imperialism, especially when our power position requires us to have many bases on foreign soil.

There are those who attribute the Formosan and Japanese controversies to Communist agitation or to anti-Americanism. A more plausible cause is that put forth by Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to Washington. He believes the difficulties have arisen from attempts to by-pass the courts of the host countries. On Formosa, the attempt was successful. (There were reports that the Army was reluctant even to bring Master Sergeant Reynolds before a military court on the charge of killing a peeping tom.)

In Japan, the Defense and State Departments have wisely (and with courage in face of strong domestic opposition) stood behind the original decision to turn over Specialist 3/c William S. Girard to local courts on the charge of causing the death of a Japanese woman in a shooting incident on an Army artillery range. Even so, the incident stirred up a measure of distrust and brought forth a plea by the opposition Socialist Party for the complete removal of *all* our troops. There has been a strange blackout on the details of the case in the American press, especially those aspects which tend to indicate that Girard's actions were foolish and outside the scope of duty.

Fortunately for all parties concerned, the judicial

system of Japan is well established and highly respected. Qualified observers agree that Girard will fare better before a Japanese judge than in a United States court-martial.

In some areas of Asia, particularly in Cambodia, Korea, Laos and certain other areas where independence has been newly won, the judicial systems are not yet well developed. The Philippines, however, have a judicial system developed under our own direction. It is unfortunate that we have not negotiated a proper agreement with this nation, particularly in light of difficulties that have arisen in its absence. Mr. Romulo notes that, under the present agreement, any violation of Philippine law, including murder, that occurs within U. S. bases is beyond the reach of their courts, even if the victim is a Filipino. Likewise, there have been cases of base personnel or their dependents who ran over children, or who caused damage to property and then escaped to the bases for immunity.

Whether in Europe or Asia, we cannot afford to undermine the national self-respect of any people. Mutual respect for each other's rights is the only sound basis for our alliances, which, after all, are in our interest and are not merely philanthropic enterprises.

W.H.C.

## Literary Criticism and the Christian Conscience: A Reply to Mr. Fitch

TOM F. DRIVER

THE APRIL 29 issue of *Christianity and Crisis* carried an article by Robert E. Fitch entitled "The Christian Criticism of Literature." Almost at the same time a book by the same author appeared on a similar theme, *The Decline and Fall of Sex* (Harcourt, Brace, & Co., \$3.00). Considered solely on their merits as contributions to the study of life or literature, both of these pieces might better be ignored. The book, however, has received at least two commendatory reviews in widely read non-church periodicals, while the *Christianity and Crisis* article contained a flagrant misinterpretation of a previous review in this journal by an outstanding critic which so far seems to have gone unchallenged. I note with approval Mr. Leroy S. Rouner's letter of rejoinder in the June 24 issue; but a contrary-minded letter beside it is a reminder that, before more damage is done, it is time to expose Mr. Fitch's inadequacies in the study of sex and literature.

Mr. Driver is Instructor in Drama at Union Theological Seminary in New York City and is a contributing Editor to the *Christian Century*.

There is presently a vogue of interest in literature and the arts among Protestants. The church must learn in time that in approaching this subject it is entering an arena of fire, from which it can emerge badly scorched. More than once the Christian Church has had to retire to lick its wounds after entering into unwise liaisons with, or ill-founded attacks upon, the realm of culture as reflected in the arts. Amos Wilder has reminded the readers of *Christianity and Crisis* (February 18, 1957) that "society lives by its symbols." The theme of sex in modern literature has become symbolic of the entire life-confusion and life-anxiety of the times. He who attacks it ought to know what he is doing.

The list of errors and misjudgments chargeable to Mr. Fitch covers an entire sheet of my notebook paper, but I can get at most of them by centering on four inter-related counts: (1) In the book there is a confusion about the relationship between life and literature, and the author therefore runs into a logical difficulty in his attack upon men of letters. As



this confusion is untangled, one discovers (2) a lack of awareness and of responsibility concerning major trends in modern society, and (3) an inability to make distinct literary judgments. The book is composed of (4) an unhealthy mixture of Puritan standards and sexual fascinations.

#### Whence "the Mess"?

The logical difficulty in the life-literature confusion is this: Is Mr. Fitch angry at the modern writers, such as Robert Anderson, Tennessee Williams, Ernest Hemingway, Eugene O'Neill, Walt Whitman, Anita Loos, Mary McCarthy, and (of all people) Elinor Glyn, or is he angry with the modern world in general, which these writers portray as having lost the "character, intelligence, morals, and mores" of former generations? Now if the modern world in general is actually in what Mr. Fitch calls "the Mess," then the writers ought not to be blamed for writing about it. Certainly their honesty and sensitivity ought not to be impugned. Mr. Fitch writes: "At the moment the popular honorifics in literature are 'brave . . . honest . . . sensitive . . . sincere.' Any dish of obscenity served up on the stage, any collection of trash spread out in a novel has its justification if the author can be made to wear the halo of one of these honorifics." But if "the Mess" is real, it is difficult to see the logic of the argument which allows Mr. Fitch to write about it with candor but refuses to allow the dramatist or novelist the same privilege.

On the other hand, if the modern world is not in "the Mess," Mr. Fitch might logically be justified in taking writers to task for inventing it or propagandizing it. But is it fair to hold the novelists and dramatists (Mr. Fitch also includes Freud and the Existentialists in his charge) responsible for the contemporary cultural crisis regarding the nature of man, his morals, and mores? To be sure, philosophers and creative writers make their contribution to the cultural situation of an age, but they are also its products; and their works mirror the culture quite as much as they create it. To ignore that fact is to abstract the artist from his times unfairly.

As Mr. Fitch is able to blame the writers for our present situation by lifting them out of their social context, so he is able to idolize Shakespeare by the same means. He describes Shakespeare as though he, and he alone, were responsible for the ethics of his plays. Shakespeare is, for him, the great literary hero because, virtuous writer that he was, he hated adultery and loved lawful marriage. There is not one word to indicate that Shakespeare lived in an age when the populace as a whole agreed. Shake-

speare voiced the conservative and popular tradition of his age—one in which no one had read Darwin, a good many rejected Copernicus, the virgin birth was unquestioned by the populace, and birth control, for all practical purposes, was unknown. If Mr. Fitch wished to write realistically, he might mention the shock which science, psychology, and Biblical criticism have administered to traditional morality. Does Mr. Fitch wish to reject these disciplines? Let him say so. But if he accepts them, he must acknowledge that they make Shakespeare as out-dated in the contemporary struggle for moral integrity as is the theory of humors in modern medicine. This in no way diminishes Shakespeare's stature as an artist. But if one has either to sacrifice the seriousness of the modern dilemma regarding sexual morality or to sacrifice Shakespeare's pedestal, it is better to remove the latter. It was George Bernard Shaw's greatness, however wrong he was in many of his moral ideas, to see that. It is better to live realistically in the present than to idolize the past.

#### "Morality"—the Criterion of Judgment

Having cut himself loose from the tether of social realism, Mr. Fitch has not enough ballast to sustain accurate literary judgments. Morality becomes his one criterion. Although he writes, "The ethical and the aesthetic are inextricably intertwined," it becomes evident that he is talking not about two things closely inter-related, but about one thing which completely determines another. Neither the article on "The Christian Criticism of Literature" nor the book contains a single sentence in which an aesthetic judgment is set forth as anything other than a moral judgment. If a writer sets forth a gospel different from that which Mr. Fitch serves, it seems to be of no consequence whether he does it well or poorly. It is nothing to him whether a writer handles language well, whether he has the power of description, whether he can create and sustain imagery, whether he has the power of evoking mood, whether he displays form, consistency, and the discipline of craft. These are aesthetic questions, and while it is true that they are often closely linked with ethical questions, it is not true that they have no independent existence. Whoever does not pay attention to them is not paying attention to the thing which makes the art of literature different from philosophy and preaching. In short, he is guilty of that very iconoclasm which has been the bane of Puritan Protestantism through most of its history, for he fails to allow the aesthetic its day.

Mr. Fitch reserves aesthetic judgment, or so he

says, for painting, sculpture, architecture, and music. "To make an ethical judgment on these arts is as irrelevant as to make an aesthetic judgment on morals." He leaves moral judgments for the novel and the drama, which "deal with the stuff of human nature" and "are another affair." But why this dichotomy? Has he never seen pornographic painting or sculpture? Has he not heard music which is erotic or sensationalist and little else? The dichotomy surely arises because, while the critic imagines he can perceive the aesthetic ingredient of the non-verbal arts, he refuses to allow for the aesthetics of words. If he did, he would see that morality and immorality can invade sight and sound as well as language, and that a writer makes a claim upon his reader to be understood as an artist handling the language, quite as much as a purveyor of morals. What is there which is Christian about a kind of criticism which is so cavalier as to ignore the very essence of the thing it would describe? Is morality only a matter of sex, and has it nothing to do with attention and care?

Had Mr. Fitch the kind of discrimination which is needed, even (and perhaps above all) by the Christian critic, he would not produce a book in which Eugene O'Neill and Elinor Glyn are put on a par as writers, nor in which modern American novels are held to be typified by *The Deer Park*. Mr. Fitch is right in saying that Ernest Hemingway's attitudes toward sex are often puerile, but that is not, as he implies, the only thing to be said about Hemingway. It is true that much of Tennessee Williams is crass, but that is not the only thing to be said of Williams. It has also to be said of both these very different writers that they are able, like many classical authors, to use sexual language to symbolize much broader and deeper questions in life. It must be said that they have looked at some of the inner terror which life today holds for millions of people and that in the face of it they have not been afraid. This certainly does not make them Christian, but it makes them more mature than the so-called "Christian critic" (abominable phrase!) whose reaction to sex in literature is that of hysterical fright or laughter.

Lack of discrimination—the inability, unprejudiced, to see a thing for what it is—must account for Mr. Fitch's misrepresentation of Nathan Scott's review of *Tea and Sympathy* (*Christianity and Crisis*, November 12, 1956). The review, said Fitch, "is unable to rise above the level of mawkish and sentimental sexuality which provided the framework of values for the author of the play." What Mr. Scott actually said was:

So the vantage-point which Mr. Anderson finally wins is too inexpensive: the cost of it has not been high enough, in terms of the moral stresses that have been weathered. And though all but the most austere hearts in his audiences will be "moved" by the film as they were "moved" by his play, this will be, I suspect, because we have all been a little corrupted by the fashionable contemporary modes of fantasy and sentimentalism.

Either Mr. Fitch cannot read well, or he cannot perceive in others that ability to sift the good from the bad which he himself so sorely lacks.

### An Aged, Deceptive Confusion

Back of the hopeless life-literature, moral-aesthetic confusions which pervade *The Decline and Fall of Sex* there appears to lie that aged, fundamentally deceptive, sex-purity confusion which popular psychology recognizes as the hallmark of Puritanism: fascination with the facts of life coupled with the zeal of the reformer. *The Decline and Fall of Sex* is written in a contemptible style—contemptible because it exploits the very thing it attacks. One of its major theses is that sex has become a commodity, meet for analysis, packaging, and distribution outside the confines of love and marriage. Few books in recent years have so frankly packaged and distributed that commodity. Mr. Fitch goes out of his way to refresh the reader's intelligence as to the hip-waist-bust measurements of Jayne Mansfield and the British Sabrina. From Charles Darwin he excavates a description of a "savage beauty the amplitude of whose hinterland was of such majestic proportions that, when she rolled over on her backside, her arms and legs dangled helplessly in the air, and she was able to get up again only with assistance from the officers of the guard." Not content with this, he has attempted wit in a passage which ought to receive some kind of prize in high school humor magazines:

... there is no reason why we might not hope for a pair of udders of such noble proportions that they would have to be held up by the most intricate engineering devices of modern corsetry, or preferably preceded and supported in front by two pages in constant attendance, and announced on all important occasions by three blasts from a trumpet.

In addition, Mr. Fitch bears the distinction of having contributed to literary criticism the notable term, "shit mysticism."

For this highly out-of-place directness, the puritan Mr. Fitch has a rationale: literary criticism, as

usually practiced, wears too much "the pose of sophistication and urbanity" (equated by him with "rationalism"), whereas it ought, for honesty's sake, to use the same four-letter vocabulary which the novelists and dramatists use. I find this reasoning perverse, as I find the whole tone of the book. Presumably a novelist or dramatist is presenting life more directly than the critic. That is his job. He will tend to choose the word which conveys emotion. He prefers the concrete to the abstract. The critic's job, however, is analysis and interpretation. If the man in the street uses four-letter words, that can be a reason for the novelist's doing the same, but hardly so for the critic. After all, one does not expect his doctor to describe the bodily functions in Anglo-Saxon terms.

### Some Amazing Approbations

After wading through the Fitch diatribe against modern fiction, one begins to ask of what he does approve. The answer reveals a judgment as warped in its enthusiasms as in its annoyances. Mr. Fitch likes *Romeo and Juliet*, *Tristan and Iseult*, Chaucer, and Aristophanes! I have tried to discover what these four have in common, and I must conclude that their only shared attributes are that they speak of sex and are not modern. Mr. Fitch likes what is Romantic. *Romeo and Juliet* and *Tristan and Iseult* are Romantic in themselves. Chaucer and Aristophanes appeal to the romantic nature because they are ancient and "classical." For no other reason can I see why a man would write: "If the portrayal of incorrigible sexuality in Chaucer, as in Aristophanes, retains a warmly human quality, it is because sexual lust is always made the comic and pathetic symbol of a larger lust for the life abundant." Aristophanes is not warmly human; he is a biting political satirist of a brilliant and bawdy wit. And what "life abundant" is it that he wishes for? When Mr. Fitch finds something he wants to endorse, even though it does not fit his own moral canons, he can be as imprecise as anyone going. Because he likes the romantic union of that o'erhasty couple, *Romeo and Juliet*, he is willing to discuss their play without once mentioning the lusty Mercutio, as lewd a wench-monger as ever walked the stage, or such Shakespearean double-entendres as that of the first duel-scene: "My naked weapon is out!" Because time, Wagner, and a number of poets have mellowed the story of *Tristan and Iseult*, Mr. Fitch is willing to turn them into ideal types, forgetting that they are the most celebrated pair of adulterers in the Western tradition and that, therefore, they fundamentally contradict his jingled thesis:

Love and marriage,

Love and marriage,

Go together like a horse and carriage.

Is the adulation of courageous adulterers what Mr. Fitch means by "Christian criticism"? He does not seem to have the courage of his Puritanism.

There will come a time, perhaps not far away, when a judgment will need to be voiced on the morals and mores of this time as reflected in its literature; but it cannot be made rightly by a man who, bouncing recklessly from one inconsistency to another, chatters all the while about character, intelligence, and morals. A handful of prejudices buttressed by promiscuous sex-hunting through contemporary fiction is not enough equipment for the job at hand. Irresponsibility can have no part in Christian strategy. At the base of prophetic judgment is love. When it comes to the efforts and struggles of contemporary fiction, Mr. Fitch is loveless. His gospel is obscurantist. Let the church follow such a voice, and it will lose all possibility of achieving an encounter between the God of Israel and the creative springs of our own culture.

## WORLD CHURCH: NEWS AND NOTES

### Gollwitzer Defends Contacts With Eastern Churches

GENEVA (EPS)—Professor Helmuth Gollwitzer has replied to attacks made on the ecumenical contacts maintained between East and West, declaring that these relationships are practical evidence of the affirmation "we intend to stay together" made by the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948. His reply is published in *Evangelische Verantwortung*, the paper of the Protestant Study Group of the Christian Democratic Union, which originally carried the criticisms.

Dr. Gollwitzer cites points to be considered in evaluating the attitude of the Eastern churches. He says that some political statements made by the Moscow Patriarchate arose from the "massive threat to this church which has for so long lived in martyrdom." The Moscow statements, according to the German theologian, are among the conditions on which the Moscow church has been able to go on living; they did not affect its spiritual life, doctrine or worship and were conditioned by the church's traditional attitude to the state. The Russian Church could not be expected to adopt an "unorthodox" stand towards the state. It was true that Western Christians had the right to disapprove political declarations of their churches, but

(Continued on page 96)





# Saint Hereticus

## The Easy Way

I am indebted to the advertising strategies of an orthodox evangelist for a way of getting my heretical work done with greater dispatch. (What heretic ever lived who was not eager to beat the orthodox at their own game?) The idea is disarmingly simple: make Christianity as easy as possible. Thus it is not hard to make a "decision for Christ" even if you have been sitting in a high balcony; you make your way to the foot of the cross via escalator. And you needn't worry about being uncomfortable while you're listening to the sermon, because, as the advertisements remind you, the place is air-conditioned.

Now my proposal is also simple: merely adapt this kind of approach to the local church. If enough attention is put on the ease and comfort of the surroundings, people will miss the demands and sternness of the gospel. In all candor, I must admit that the application on the local church level is not solely mine. Somebody has already beaten me to the draw, for I know of churches that advertise that if you arrive too late to get a seat in the nave there are "comfortable overflow chapels" to accommodate you. This is, I suppose, appropriate to a comfortably accommodating gospel, and suggests that a well-known hymn may need revision:

He leadeth me, O blessed thought,  
To air-conditioned chapels fraught  
With cushioned pews, where I may see  
The minister on closed TV.

Verily, those who go there will have their own reward. But The Easy Way can be exploited by other means as well.

For example, appeals could be launched to "Join the Presbyterian High School Youth Group (Only Church in Town That Let's You Dance)". Or a doorbell-ringing campaign could be instituted on the pitch, "Look here, my man, you've got just the build for our Lutheran Men's Club. We've got the best bowling team in the local church league." Or a quiet, confidential phone call could go, "My dear, you simply *must* join the Congregational Women's

Circle. We have the most *divine* time sewing. That's *all* we do. You don't need to worry that you'll get caught in one of those embarrassing situations where you have to *pray* in *public*. And as for keeping up on what's going on in town . . ." Or, finally, a mailing campaign could be initiated with the slogan, "The Methodist Church needs you—you need the Methodist Church," which being translated is, "Man to man, now, here's the story. Don't worry that we're going to make you do a lot of work. We simply need to get our church roll up to 2,000 members before the annual report is sent in. And remember, your weekly offerings are deductible from your income tax."

How infinitely superior all this is to letting the notion get abroad that if you joined the Youth Group some demands might be put on you. How much safer for the men to bowl rather than to talk about the relationship of the faith to their businesses. How fortunate for the members of the sewing circle that they run no risk of bumping up against the 3rd chapter of James and its comments about the gossiping tongue. How splendid that the church that is out for new members on any terms need never pause to hear Christ's words, "Because you are lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spew you out of my mouth."

It looks, in fact, as though we'd better rewrite one more hymn:

Jerusalem the golden,  
With milk and honey blest,  
Our local church is better,  
'Tis not with heat oppressed;  
Our minister is kindly,  
He never gives offense,  
Our congregation blindly  
Pays off its debt immense.

### In Our Next Issue

DANIEL DAY WILLIAMS discusses some important contributions in the continuing development of law that are of significance for the Protestants. He will make particular reference to *The Moral Decision* by Edmond Cahn.

### The Silent Generation

may find some virtue in its silence if it is an intelligent silence. As friends and relatives graduate from college and seminary, let their silence be enlightened—give each an introductory (ten month) gift subscription now at the special rate of \$2.00.

## WORLD CHURCH: NEWS AND NOTES

(Continued from page 94)

the Western Christian had no right to criticize churches and church leaders in the East "from the safety of his own harbor," and to express pharisaical opinions about people and churches living under oppression.

Official church leaders in Eastern Europe "are appointed in accordance with church order and fully recognized in their office by the congregations," Gollwitzer continues, arguing that it is necessary to work through these leaders to get in touch with Christians under communism. It had been decided, in Germany and in the ecumenical movement, to resolve the situation by working through the church leaders. "The outcome," writes Gollwitzer, "has proved that we are right. It has shown us how guilty we should have been if we had failed to seize the opportunities which have opened up during the last few years."

Affirming that through exchanges it has been possible "to visit Christian churches and our brethren, including church leaders, to strengthen them, understand them better and exchange impressions," Dr. Gollwitzer recalls that "the congregations on the other side gave our delegates a very joyful and friendly welcome, which in itself would be sufficient justification of our decision." He says that the point was that "those churches must live not in isolation through any fault of ours, because such isolation would increase the danger of their position." He claims that the attitude of Christians in the West must be constantly conveyed to them because such discussion fulfills the Church's task of reconciliation in a divided world.

"In doing this," Professor Gollwitzer reiterates, "we are merely putting into practice the principles on which the whole ecumenical movement rests. Churches which are separated from each other for spiritual or practical reasons, and even those which regard one another as heretical, must try to seek fellowship for the sake of the Lord of the Church, without demanding concessions from each other

beforehand. Everything we have to ask one another must be discussed after the contacts have been made on an established basis, and then discussed quite frankly. If one starts by laying down conditions one makes ecumenism quite impossible—and that not only in the case of East-West relations."

## CORRESPONDENCE

### "Too Easy on the Democrats . . ."

TO THE EDITORS: I am disappointed in your editorial, "The President's Budget," in your June 10 issue. In the editorial, I think you are too easy on the Democrats and too hard on the Republicans. You say that the Democrats would be "wiser to support the budget rather than oppose it." Since, as you say, "the security of the nation hangs on the policy incorporated in the budget," why not say that the Democrats would be more *honorable* to support the budget? In such a situation, being political comes at too high a price.

And you are too easy on the Democrats, too, I think, in the ease with which you shift responsibility for their opposition to the budget from them to President Eisenhower who, in 1952, made "extravagant . . . promises" about budget cuts. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"—as I see it, there is little excuse for the Democrats being *that* political.

O. E. Turpin  
Omaha, Neb.

## CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*

537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*  
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*  
ARNOLD W. HEARN, *Assistant Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES      WALDO BEACH      AMOS WILDER  
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN      F. ERNEST JOHNSON  
JOSEPH SITTLER      HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

FRANCIS P. MILLER      J. OSCAR LEE  
JOHN BAILLIE      WILLIAM F. MAY      ROGER L. SHINN  
KENNETH W. THOMPSON      WILLIAM LEE MILLER  
HENRY SMITH LEIPER      JOHN A. MACKAY  
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

### CONTENTS

LITERARY CRITICISM AND THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE:  
A REPLY TO MR. FITCH      TOM F. DRIVER  
THE EASY WAY      ST. HERETICUS

Detroit Public Library  
Book Receiving Dept.  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-57